

REMARKS

I. Status of the Claims

As indicated in the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment, the After Final Amendment filed November 17, 2003, mistakenly failed to list claims 1-43 as canceled. This Revised Amendment corrects this obvious error.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. Claims 44-50, 56, 59, 60, 62-65, 68, 69, and 70-78 were rejected. Claims 51-55, 57, 58, 61, 66, 67, 70 and 71 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but otherwise allowable. Claim 44 and those claims dependent thereon have been amended to, *inter alia*, incorporate the limitations of claim 52 relating to viscosity. Claim 52 has been canceled, and claim 79 has been added. Claims 51, 66, and 67, which were objected to, have been re-drafted in independent form. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification as filed, claim 44 (before this amendment), and canceled claim 52. Support for the amendment to claims 74 and 75 can be found at, for example, paragraph [047] of the specification (as amended on May 12, 2003); support for the amendment to claims 76, 77, and 78 can be found at, for example, paragraph [045] of the specification (as amended on May 12, 2003). No new matter has been added.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 44-50, 56, 59, 60, 62-65, 68, 69, and 73-78 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 3,106,476 to Millman. Applicant continues to traverse this rejection for

the reasons already of record. In an effort to facilitate prosecution, however, Applicant has amended the rejected claims to include the viscosity limitation of claim 52, which was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Accordingly, this rejection is believed to be moot.

III. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claim 72 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite as to scope and incomplete as to its membership in not reciting "the group consisting of" after "chosen from". Applicant traverses this rejection at least for the reasons already of record (with regard to original claims 22 and 43). Nevertheless, in order to facilitate prosecution, Applicant has amended the claim in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Entry of the foregoing amendment is requested at least because it puts the claims in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would be useful in resolving any outstanding issues, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned counsel at (202) 408-6020.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 4, 2004

Michelle P. Bosch
By: Reg. No. 40,524
Louis M. Troilo
for Reg. No. 45,284

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com